arXiv:1405.4314v1 [hep-ph] 16 May 2014

CERN-PH-TH-2014-080
May 20, 2014

Naturalness in low-scale SUSY models and "non-linear" MSSM

I. Antoniadis [a], **E. M. Babalic** [b], **D. M. Ghilencea** [a,b,]

[a] CERN Theory Division, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland
[b] Theoretical Physics Department, National Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering (IFIN-HH) Bucharest, MG-6 077125, Romania.

Abstract

In MSSM models with various boundary conditions for the soft breaking terms (m_{soft}) and for a higgs mass of 126 GeV, there is a (minimal) electroweak fine-tuning $\Delta \approx 800$ to 1000 for the constrained MSSM and $\Delta \approx 500$ for non-universal gaugino masses. These values, often regarded as unacceptably large, may indicate a problem of supersymmetry (SUSY) breaking, rather than of SUSY itself. A minimal modification of these models is to lower the SUSY breaking scale in the hidden sector ($\sqrt{f}$) to few TeV, which we show to restore naturalness to more acceptable levels $\Delta \approx 80$ for the most conservative case of low $\tan\beta$ and ultraviolet boundary conditions as in the constrained MSSM. This is done without introducing additional fields in the visible sector, unlike other models that attempt to reduce Δ. In the present case Δ is reduced due to additional (effective) quartic higgs couplings proportional to the ratio $m_{soft}/\sqrt{f}$ of the visible to the hidden sector SUSY breaking scales. These couplings are generated by the auxiliary component of the goldstino superfield. The model is discussed in the limit its sgoldstino component is integrated out so this superfield is realized non-linearly (hence the name of the model) while the other MSSM superfields are in their linear realization. By increasing the hidden sector scale $\sqrt{f}$ one obtains a continuous transition for fine-tuning values, from this model to the usual (gravity mediated) MSSM-like models.

1 Introduction

If supersymmetry (SUSY) is realized in Nature, it should be broken at some high scale. A consequence of SUSY breaking is the existence of a Goldstone fermion - the goldstino - and its scalar superpartner, the sgoldstino. The goldstino becomes the longitudinal component of the gravitino which is rendered massive (super-Higgs mechanism), with a mass of order f/M_P where $\sqrt{f}$ is the scale of spontaneous supersymmetry breaking in the hidden sector and M_P is the Planck scale. Also, the sgoldstino can become massive and decouple at low energies. One interesting possibility is that $\sqrt{f} \ll M_P$ which represents the case of so-called low-scale SUSY breaking models that we analyze in this work. Then the longitudinal gravitino component couplings which are those of the goldstino and proportional to $1/\sqrt{f}$ [1] are much stronger than the couplings of the transverse gravitino component fields which are Planck-scale suppressed. The latter vanish in the gravity-decoupled limit and one is left with a goldstino superfield besides the matter and vector superfields of the model. The gravitino is then very light, in the milli-eV range if SUSY breaking is in the multi-TeV region.

In this work we consider a variation of the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) called "non-linear MSSM" defined in [2] (see also [3, 4]) in which $\sqrt{f}$ is a free parameter that can be as low as few times the scale of soft breaking terms in the visible sector, denoted generically m_{soft}. We assume that all fields beyond the MSSM spectrum (if any) are heavier than $\sqrt{f}$ (including the sgoldstino). Then, at energies of few TeV, $E \sim m_{soft} < \sqrt{f}$ we have the MSSM fields and the (non-linear) goldstino superfield (X) coupled to them. The auxiliary component field F_X (with $\langle F_X \rangle \sim -f$) of X can mediate interactions ($\propto 1/f$) between the MSSM fields and generate sizeable effective couplings, in particular in the Higgs sector, if $\sqrt{f}$ is low (few TeV). The study of their implications for the electroweak (EW) fine-tuning is one main purpose of this work. This energy regime can be described by a nonlinear goldstino superfield[1], that satisfies $X^2 = 0$ [4, 5, 6]. This constraint decouples (integrates out) the scalar component of X (sgoldstino), independent of the visible sector details (it depends only on the hidden sector [7]). The alternative case of a light sgoldstino, that can mix with the Standard Model (SM) higgs, was studied in [3, 8]. At even lower energies, below the sparticle masses one is left with the goldstino fermion coupled to SM fields only, and all supermultiplets are realized nonlinearly, i.e. all superpartners are integrated out.

However, with so far negative searches for supersymmetry at the TeV-scale, the original motivation for SUSY, of solving the hierarchy problem, is sometimes questioned, since the stability at the quantum level of the hierarchy EW scale $\ll M_P$ becomes more difficult to respect. Indeed, the EW scale $v^2 = -m^2/\lambda$ where m is a combination of soft masses (m_{soft}), therefore $m \sim$ TeV and $\lambda \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ an effective quartic higgs coupling; with an increasing $m \sim m_{soft}$, it is more difficult to obtain $v = 246$ GeV. This tension is quantified by EW scale fine-tuning measures hereafter denoted generically Δ with two examples Δ_m, Δ_q [9, 10] (early studies in [11]) defined as

$$\Delta_m = \max \left| \Delta_{\gamma^2} \right|, \quad \Delta_q = \Big\{ \sum_{\gamma} \Delta_{\gamma^2}^2 \Big\}^{1/2}, \quad \text{with } \Delta_{\gamma^2} \equiv \frac{\partial \ln v^2}{\partial \ln \gamma^2}, \tag{1}$$

[1] hence the name of the model as "nonlinear" MSSM.

Δ_q and Δ_m quantify the variation of v under small relative variations of the ultraviolet (UV) parameters γ that denote the SUSY breaking parameters and the (bare) higgsino mass (μ_0). $\Delta_{m,q}$ are regarded as intuitive measures of the success of SUSY as a solution to the hierarchy problem. For the constrained MSSM, γ denotes the set: m_0, m_{12}, μ_0, A_t, B_0. For the recently measured Standard Model-like higgs mass $m_h \approx 126$ GeV [12], *minimal* values of $\Delta_{m,q}$ in the constrained MSSM are $\approx 800 - 1000$ [13], reduced to ≈ 500 for non-universal boundary conditions for gauginos. These values are rather far from those regarded by theorists as more "acceptable" (but still subjective) of 10 to 100.

One can ask however what relevance such values of the EW fine-tuning have for the realistic character of a model and whether less subjective, model-independent bounds actually exist. Recent results [14] (based on previous [13, 15]) suggest that there is an interesting link between the EW fine tuning and the minimal value of chi-square (χ^2_{min}) to fit the EW observables. Under the condition that motivated SUSY of *fixing* the EW scale $v = v(\gamma)$ to its value (246 GeV) and with some simplifying assumptions it was found that there exists a model independent upper bound $\Delta_q \ll \exp(n_{df})$ [14]; here n_{df} is the number of degrees of freedom of the model, $n_{df} = n_{\mathcal{O}} - n_p$ with $n_{\mathcal{O}}$ the number of observables and n_p the number of parameters. Generically, $n_{df} \sim 10$ or so, see for example Table 1 in second reference in [14], depending on the boundary conditions of the MSSM-like model. This gives $\Delta_q \ll \exp 5 \approx 150$ or so. This is an estimate of the magnitude one should seek for Δ and supports the common view mentioned above that a tuning $\Delta_q \approx 100$ is "acceptable". It should be noted however, that the nearly exponential dependence of minimal $\Delta_{m,q} \approx \exp(m_h/\text{GeV})$ noticed in [17] and the theoretical error of 2-3 GeV of the Higgs mass [16] bring an error factor to the "acceptable" value of Δ as large as $\exp(2) \approx 7.4$ (or $\exp(3) \approx 20$). Therefore any value of Δ should be regarded with due care. Nevertheless, the above results tell us that a small Δ is preferable.

This view is further confirmed by a less conservative approach which shows that there is also a link between the EW fine tuning and the covariance matrix of a model [18, 19] in the basis of UV parameters (γ). This matrix was shown [19] to automatically contain contributions due to the EW fine-tuning wrt parameters γ and, in particular, the trace of its inverse contains a contribution proportional to Δ_q. As a result, imposing a fixed, s-standard deviation of the value of chi-square χ^2 of a model from its minimal value χ^2_{min} i.e. $\delta\chi^2 \leq s^2$, ($\chi^2 = \chi^2_{min} + \delta\chi^2$) then demands in the loop order considered that Δ_q have an upper bound [19]. This is a model-independent result and supports our motivation here of seeking models with low Δ.

A very large EW fine tuning, that increases further with negative searches for SUSY may suggest that we do not understand well the mechanism of SUSY breaking (assuming that SUSY exists not far above the TeV-scale). This motivated us to consider the models with low SUSY breaking scale mentioned above and to evaluate their EW fine-tuning. A previous analysis in such models can be found in [20, 21]. We examine the values of both Δ_m and Δ_q in the "non-linear MSSM" [2] which has a low scale of SUSY breaking, $\sqrt{f} \sim$ few TeV. The only difference of this model from the usual MSSM is present in the gravitino/goldstino and dark matter sectors. We show that this model can have a reduced fine-tuning compared to that in the MSSM-like models. The reduction is done without additional parameters or extra fields in the "visible" sector which is unlike other models that reduce EW fine-tuning by enlarging the spectrum. Our results depend only on the ratio m^2_{soft}/f of the SUSY breaking

scale in the visible sector to that in the hidden sector. When $\sqrt{f}$ is low (few TeV) we are in the region of low-scale-SUSY breaking models (with light gravitino) while at large $\sqrt{f} \sim 10^{10}$ GeV we recover the MSSM-like models. We thus have an interpolating parameter between these classes of models. The reason why EW fine-tuning is reduced is due to additional quartic higgs interactions mediated by the auxiliary component of the goldstino superfield, as mentioned earlier; these enhance the *effective* higgs coupling λ and even increase the higgs mass already at tree level. We stress that this behaviour is generic to low-scale SUSY models.

In the next section we review the model. In Section 3 we compute analytically the one-loop corrected higgs mass including $\mathcal{O}(1/f^2)$ corrections from effective operators generated by SUSY breaking. In Section 4 we compute at one-loop $\Delta_{m,q}$ as functions of the SUSY breaking parameters and $\sqrt{f}$ and then present their numerical values in terms of the one-loop SM-like higgs mass. For a most conservative case of low $\tan\beta$ and constrained MSSM boundary conditions for the soft terms, we find in "non-linear" MSSM an "acceptable" $\Delta_m \approx 80$ ($\Delta_q \approx 120$) for $\sqrt{f} = 2.8$ TeV and $m_h \approx 126$ GeV. This value of Δ can be reduced further for non-universal gaugino masses and is well below that in the constrained MSSM (for any $\tan\beta$) where $\Delta_{m,q} \sim 800 - 1000$ [13]. This reduction is done without enlarging the MSSM spectrum (for an example with additional massive singlets see [22]).

2 The Lagrangian in "non-linear" MSSM

The Lagrangian of the "non-linear MSSM" model can be written as [2, 3, 4]

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_X + \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2 \tag{2}$$

$\mathcal{L}_0$ is the usual MSSM SUSY Lagrangian which we write below to establish the notation:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_0 \;=\; & \sum_{\Phi, H_{1,2}} \int d^4\theta\; \Phi^\dagger\, e^{V_i}\, \Phi + \Big\{ \int d^2\theta \Big[\mu\, H_1\, H_2 + H_2\, Q\, U^c + Q\, D^c\, H_1 + L\, E^c\, H_1 \Big] + h.c. \Big\} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{1}{16\, g_i^2\, \kappa} \int d^2\theta\, \mathrm{Tr}\,[\, W^\alpha\, W_\alpha]_i + h.c., \qquad \Phi : Q, D^c, U^c, E^c, L\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

κ is a constant canceling the trace factor and the gauge coupling is g_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$ for $U(1)_Y$, $SU(2)_L$, $SU(3)$ respectively. Further, $\mathcal{L}_X$ is the Lagrangian of the goldstino superfield $X = (\phi_X, \psi_X, F_X)$ that breaks SUSY spontaneously and whose Weyl component is "eaten" by the gravitino (super-Higgs effect [23]). $\mathcal{L}_X$ can be written as [4]

$$\mathcal{L}_X = \int d^4\theta\, X^\dagger X + \Big\{ \int d^2\theta\, f\, X + h.c. \Big\} \qquad \text{with} \qquad X^2 = 0. \tag{4}$$

The otherwise interaction-free $\mathcal{L}_X$ when endowed with a constraint $X^2 = 0$ [4, 5, 6] describes (onshell) the Akulov-Volkov Lagrangian of the goldstino [24], see also [25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30], with non-linear SUSY. The constraint has a solution $\phi_X = \psi_X \psi_X / (2F_X)$ that projects (integrates) out the sgoldstino field which becomes massive and is appropriate for a low

energy description of SUSY breaking. Further, $\langle F_X \rangle \sim -f$ fixes the SUSY breaking scale ($\sqrt{f}$) and the breaking is transmitted to the visible sector by the couplings of X to the MSSM superfields, to generate the usual SUSY breaking (effective) terms in $\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2$ (see below). These couplings are commonly parametrized (onshell) in terms of the spurion field $S = m_{soft}\theta\theta$ where m_{soft} is a generic notation for the soft masses (later denoted $m_{1,2,3}$, m_{λ_i}); however, this parametrisation obscures the dynamics of X (offshell effects) relevant below that generates additional Feynman diagrams mediated by F_X (Figure 1). Such effects are not seen in the leading order (in $1/f$) in the spurion formalism. The offshell couplings are easily recovered by the formal replacement [4]

$$S \to \frac{m_{soft}}{f} X \tag{5}$$

In this way one obtains the SUSY breaking couplings that are indeed identical to those obtained by the equivalence theorem [1] from a theory with the corresponding explicit soft breaking terms and in which the Goldstino fermion couples to the derivative of the supercurrent of the initial theory. These couplings are generated by the D-terms below

$$\mathcal{L}_1 \;=\; \sum_{i=1,2} c_i \int d^4\theta \; X^\dagger X \; H_i^\dagger \, e^{V_i} \, H_i + \sum_{\Phi} c_\Phi \int d^4\theta \; X^\dagger X \, \Phi^\dagger e^V \, \Phi. \tag{6}$$

and by the F-terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_2 \;=\; & \sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{1}{16\, g_i^2\, \kappa} \frac{2\, m_{\lambda_i}}{f} \int d^2\theta \, X \, \mathrm{Tr}\, [\, W^\alpha \, W_\alpha]_i + c_3 \int d^2\theta \, X \, H_1 \, H_2 \\ + \;\; & \frac{A_u}{f} \int d^2\theta \, X \, H_2 \, Q \, U^c + \frac{A_d}{f} \int d^2\theta \, X \, Q \, D^c \, H_1 + \frac{A_e}{f} \int d^2\theta \, X \, L \, E^c \, H_1 + h.c. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

with

$$c_j = -\frac{m_j^2}{f^2}, \; j = 1, 2; \qquad c_3 = -\frac{m_3^2}{f}, \qquad c_\Phi = -\frac{m_\Phi^2}{f^2}, \qquad \Phi : Q, U^c, D^c, L, E^c, \tag{8}$$

In the UV one can eventually take $m_\Phi = m_0 = m_1 = m_2$, $m_{\lambda_i} = m_{12}$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ for all gaugino masses, $m_3^2 = B_0\, m_0\, \mu_0$, ($\mu \equiv \mu_0$ in the UV) and these define the "constrained" version of the "non-linear" MSSM, discussed later. For simplicity, Yukawa matrices are not displayed; to recover them just replace above any pair of fields $\phi_Q \phi_U \to \phi_Q \gamma_u \phi_U$, $\phi_Q \phi_D \to \phi_Q \gamma_d \phi_D$, $\phi_L \, \phi_E \to \phi_L \gamma_e \phi_E$; similar for the fermions and auxiliary fields, with $\gamma_{u,d,e}$ 3×3 matrices.

The total Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ defines the model discussed in detail in [2]. The only difference from the ordinary MSSM is in the supersymmetry breaking sector. In the calculation of the onshell Lagrangian we restrict the calculations to up to and including $1/f^2$ terms. This requires solving for F_ϕ of matter fields up to and including $1/f^2$ terms and for F_X up to and including $1/f^3$ terms (due to its leading contribution which is -f). In this situation, in the final Lagrangian no kinetic mixing is present at the order used[2].

[2]We stress that at energy scales below m_{soft}, similar constraints to that used for X ($X^2 = 0$) can be applied



Figure 1: The diagrams that generate the new quartic effective higgs couplings in V, eq.(9). The coefficients $c_{1,2,3}$ are generated by $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2$. F_X is the auxiliary component of X that breaks SUSY. The left (right) diagrams are generated by D (F) terms in the action, while the middle one is a mixture of both. These interactions are generic and important in low-scale SUSY breaking models [20, 21] (in MSSM they are strongly suppressed since $\langle F_X \rangle$ is large).

3 The Higgs masses at one-loop in "non-linear" MSSM

From the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ one obtains the Higgs scalar potential of the model[3]

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \left(|\mu|^2 + m_1^2\right)|h_1|^2 + \left(|\mu|^2 + m_2^2\right)|h_2|^2 - \left(m_3^2\, h_1.h_2 + h.c.\right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{f^2}\left|m_1^2\,|h_1|^2 + m_2^2\,|h_2|^2 - m_3^2\, h_1.h_2\right|^2 + \frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\left[|h_1|^2 - |h_2|^2\right]^2 + \frac{g_2^2}{2}\,|h_1^\dagger\, h_2|^2 \\ &+ \frac{g_1^2+g_2^2)}{8}\,\delta\,|h_2|^4 + \mathcal{O}(1/f^3) \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

with $h_1.h_2 = h_1^0 h_2^0 - h_1^- h_2^+$, $|h_1|^2 = |h_1^0|^2 + |h_1^-|^2$, $|h_2|^2 = |h_2^0|^2 + |h_2^+|^2$.

What is interesting in the above higgs potential is the presence of the first term in the second line of V, absent in MSSM, that is generated by the diagrams in Figure 1. Therefore, quartic higgs terms are generated by the dynamics of the goldstino superfield and are not captured by the usual spurion formalism in the MSSM. The impact of these terms for phenomenology is important and analyzed below, for when $\sqrt{f} \sim$ few TeV, see [20, 21] for a related study. When $\sqrt{f}$ is very large which is the case of MSSM-like models, these terms are negligible and thus not included by the spurion formalism. The ignored higher order terms $\mathcal{O}(1/f^3)$ involve non-renormalizable $h_{1,2}^6$ interactions in V and are not considered here[4]. Finally, the radiatively corrected $m_{1,2,3}$ and μ in V depend on the scale (hereafter denoted t) while the term $\delta|h_2|^4$ is generated at one-loop by top-stop Yukawa couplings. We thus neglect other Yukawa couplings and our one-loop analysis is valid for low $\tan\beta$; including two-loop leading log effects δ is

$$\delta = \frac{3\,h_t^4}{g^2\pi^2}\left\{\ln\frac{M_{\tilde{t}}}{m_t} + \frac{X_t}{4} + \frac{1}{32\pi^2}\left(3\,h_t^2 - 16\,g_3^2\right)\left(X_t + 2\ln\frac{M_{\tilde{t}}}{m_t}\right)\ln\frac{M_{\tilde{t}}}{m_t}\right\} \tag{10}$$

to the MSSM superfields themselves and correspond to integrating out the massive superpartners [4].

[3] In the standard notation for a two-higgs doublet model $V = \tilde{m}_1^2\,|h_1|^2 + \tilde{m}_2^2\,|h_2|^2 - (m_3^2\,h_1\cdot h_2 + h.c.) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_1\,|h_1|^4 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_2\,|h_2|^4 + \lambda_3\,|h_1|^2\,|h_2|^2 + \lambda_4\,|h_1\cdot h_2|^2 + \left[\frac{1}{2}\lambda_5\,(h_1\cdot h_2)^2 + \lambda_6\,|h_1|^2\,(h_1\cdot h_2) + \lambda_7\,|h_2|^2\,(h_1\cdot h_2) + h.c.\right]$ where $\tilde{m}_1^2 = m_1^2 + |\mu|^2$, $\tilde{m}_2^2 = m_2^2 + |\mu|^2$. $\lambda_1/2 = g^2/8 + m_1^4/f^2$, $\lambda_2/2 = g^2\,(1+\delta)/8 + m_2^4/f^2$, $\lambda_3 = (g_2^2 - g_1^2)/4 + 2\,m_1^2 m_2^2/f^2$, $\lambda_4 = -g_2^2/2 + m_3^4/f^2$, $\lambda_5 = 0$, $\lambda_6 = -m_1^2 m_3^2/f^2$, $\lambda_7 = -m_2^2 m_3^2/f^2$, $g^2 = g_1^2 + g_2^2$.

[4] Effective operators in the Higgs sector in the SUSY context were discussed in the past [21, 31, 32].

where

$$X_t \equiv \frac{2(A_t\, m_0 - \mu \cot\beta)^2}{M_{\tilde{t}}^2}\Big(1 - \frac{(A_t\, m_0 - \mu\cot\beta)^2}{12 M_{\tilde{t}}^2}\Big), \tag{11}$$

$M_{\tilde{t}}^2 = m_{\tilde{t}_1}\, m_{\tilde{t}_2}$ and g_3 is the QCD coupling and A_t is the dimensionless trilinear top coupling[5].

The minimum conditions of the potential can be written

$$-\,v^2 = \frac{m^2}{\lambda}, \qquad 2\,\lambda\,\frac{\partial m^2}{\partial\beta} - m^2\,\frac{\partial\lambda}{\partial\beta} = 0 \tag{12}$$

with the notation[6]:

$$\begin{aligned} m^2 &\equiv (m_1^2+\mu^2)\,\cos^2\beta + (m_2^2+\mu^2)\,\sin^2\beta - m_3^2\,\sin 2\beta \\ \lambda &\equiv \frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\Big[\cos^2 2\beta + \delta\sin^4\beta\Big] + \frac{1}{f^2}\Big|m_1^2\cos^2\beta + m_2^2\sin^2\beta - (1/2)\,m_3^2\,\sin 2\beta\Big|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The correction to the effective quartic higgs coupling λ, due to the soft terms ($m_{1,2,3}$) has implications for the higgs mass and EW fine tuning. This positive correction could alleviate the relation between v^2 and m^2: indeed, with $m \sim \mathcal{O}(1\text{ TeV})$ and $\lambda \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$, v can only be of order $\mathcal{O}(1\,\text{TeV})$ as well. This brings a tension between the EW scale and soft terms ($\sim m$) which cannot easily be separated from each other; this tension is encoded by the EW fine-tuning measures, discussed in Section 4. Increasing λ can alleviate this tension, with impact on the EW fine tuning. Such correction to λ also arises in models with high scale breaking in the hidden sector, so it is present even in usual MSSM but is extremely small in that case since then $\sqrt{f} \sim 10^{10}$ GeV. Here we consider $\sqrt{f} \sim$ few TeV, which is safely above the current lower bound of ≈ 700 GeV [2, 21, 33, 34].

The two minimum conditions of the scalar potential lead to:

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^2 - m_2^2 &= \cot 2\beta\left[-m_3^2 + \frac{f^2}{v^2}\frac{(-1+\sqrt{w_0})\,[\,m_3^2 + m_Z^2\,\sin 2\beta\,\big(1 - (\delta\sin^2\beta)/(2\cos 2\beta)\big)\,]}{2\,\mu^2 + m_Z^2(\cos^2 2\beta + \delta\sin^4\beta) - m_3^2\,\sin 2\beta}\right] \\ m_1^2 + m_2^2 &= \frac{1}{\sin 2\beta}\left[m_3^2 + \frac{f^2}{v^2}\frac{(-1+\sqrt{w_0})\,[-m_3^2 + \big(2\mu^2 + (\delta/2)m_Z^2\sin^2\beta\big)\,\sin 2\beta]}{2\mu^2 + m_Z^2\,(\cos^2 2\beta + \delta\sin^4\beta) - m_3^2\sin 2\beta}\right] \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where:

$$w_0 \equiv 1 - \frac{v^2}{f^2}\left(4\mu^2 + 2\,m_Z^2\,(\cos^2 2\beta + \delta\,\sin^4\beta) - 2\,m_3^2\,\sin 2\beta\right) \tag{15}$$

There is a second solution for $m_{1,2}^2$ at the minimum (with minus in front of $\sqrt{w_0}$) which however is not a perturbation of the MSSM solution and is not considered below (since it brings a shift

[5] More exactly $A_t = A_u/m_0$ with A_u as in eq.(7).

[6] Also $\lambda \equiv (\lambda_1/2)c_\beta^4 + (\lambda_2/2)\,s_\beta^4 + (\lambda_3+\lambda_4+\lambda_5)\,s_\beta^2\,c_\beta^2 + 2\lambda_6\,c_\beta^3\,s_\beta + 2\lambda_7\,c_\beta\,s_\beta^3$ where we used the notation of footnote 3 and $s_\beta = \sin\beta$, $c_\beta = \cos\beta$, $u \equiv \tan\beta = v_2/v_1$, $h_i = 1/\sqrt{2}\,(v_i + \tilde{h}_i)$, $m_Z^2 = (g_1^2+g_2^2)\,v^2/4$.

proportional to f of the soft masses, which invalidates the expansion in $m^2_{1,2}/f$).

The mass of the pseudoscalar higgs is, including a one-loop correction (due to δ):

$$m_A^2 = \frac{2m_3^2}{\sin 2\beta}\Big\{\frac{3+\sqrt{w}_0}{4} - \frac{m_3^2\, v^2}{4f^2}\,\sin 2\beta\Big\} \tag{16}$$

which can be expanded to $\mathcal{O}(1/f^3)$ using the expression of w_0. For large f one recovers its MSSM expression at one-loop. Further, we computed the masses $m_{h,H}$ including the one-loop correction (due to δ) to find:

$$m^2_{h,H} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\Big[m_A^2 + m_Z^2 \mp \sqrt{w} + \delta\, m_Z^2\,\sin^2\beta\Big] + \Delta m^2_{h,H} \tag{17}$$

with upper (lower) sign corresponding to m_h (m_H) and the correction $\Delta m^2_{h,H} = \mathcal{O}(1/f^2)$ is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta m^2_{h,H} = \frac{v^2}{64\, f^2}\Big\{ & 8\,\big[\,8\mu^4 - 2\,m_A^2\,\mu^2 + 4\mu^2\, m_Z^2 + m_Z^4 + (2\,m_A^2\,\mu^2 + 4\,\mu^2\, m_Z^2 + m_Z^4)\cos 4\beta\,\big] \\
- \;& 16\,\delta\, m_Z^2\,\big[m_A^2 - 4\mu^2 + (m_A^2 + 2m_Z^2)\cos 2\beta\,\big]\sin^4\beta + 16\,\delta^2\, m_Z^4\sin^6\beta \\
\pm \;& (1/\sqrt{w})\Big[3\,m_A^6 - m_A^4(16\mu^2 + m_Z^2) + 4m_A^2(16\mu^4 + 4\mu^2\, m_Z^2 + m_Z^4) - 8m_Z^4(4\mu^2 + m_Z^2) \\
- \;& 4\big[m_A^6 + m_A^4(m_Z^2 - 4\mu^2) - 2m_A^2 m_Z^2(6\mu^2 + m_Z^2) + 2m_Z^2(8\mu^4 + 4\mu^2 m_Z^2 + m_Z^4)\big]\cos 4\beta \\
+ \;& m_A^2\,(m_A^2 + m_Z^2)(m_A^2 + 4m_Z^2)\cos 8\beta + 4\,\delta\, m_Z^2\,\big[-m_A^4 - 2m_Z^4 + m_A^2(8\mu^2 + m_Z^2) \\
+ \;& \big((m_A^2 - 4\mu^2)^2 - 3(m_A^2 - 8\mu^2)m_Z^2 + 7m_Z^4\big)\cos 2\beta + \big(m_A^4 + (3m_A^2 - 8\mu^2)m_Z^2 \\
- \;& 2m_Z^4\big)\cos 4\beta - (m_A^4 + m_A^2 m_Z^2 - m_Z^4)\cos 6\beta\big]\sin^2\beta + 16\,\delta^2\, m_Z^4\,(m_A^2 - 4\mu^2 \\
+ \;& 3\,m_Z^2\cos 2\beta)\sin^6\beta - 16\,\delta^3\, m_Z^6\sin^8\beta\Big]\Big\} + \mathcal{O}(1/f^3).
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

with

$$w \equiv (m_A^2 + m_Z^2)^2 - 4\,m_A^2\, m_Z^2\,\cos^2 2\beta + 2\,\delta\,(m_A^2 - m_Z^2)\, m_Z^2\,\cos(2\beta)\,\sin^2\beta + \delta^2\, m_Z^4\sin^4\beta \tag{19}$$

It is illustrative to take the limit of large $\tan\beta$ on $m^2_{h,H}$ with m_A fixed. One finds

$$\begin{aligned}
m_h^2 \;&=\; \big[(1+\delta)m_Z^2 + \frac{v^2}{2f^2}\big(2\mu^2 + (1+\delta)\, m_Z^2\big)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\cot^2\beta)\big] + \mathcal{O}(1/f^3), \\
m_H^2 \;&=\; \big[m_A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\cot^2\beta)\big] + \mathcal{O}(1/f^3).
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where we ignored the $\tan\beta$ dependence of δ. Due to the $\mathcal{O}(\cot^2\beta)$ suppression, eq.(20) is valid even at smaller $\tan\beta \sim 10$. In this limit a significant increase of m_h to 120 or even 126 GeV is easily achieved, driven by classical effects alone with μ near TeV (and eventually small quantum corrections, $\delta \sim 0.5$). Such increase due to μ is thus of SUSY origin, even though the quartic Higgs couplings ($\mathcal{O}(1/f^2)$) giving this effect involved the soft masses $m_{1,2,3}$. These combined to give, at the EW minimum, the μ-dependent increase in eq.(20). For large f one recovers the MSSM value of $m_{h,H}$, at one loop. Eqs.(17), (18) are used in Section 4 to analyze the EW fine-tuning as a function of m_h.

4 The electroweak scale fine tuning

4.1 General results

To compute the EW fine tuning we use two definitions for it already shown in Introduction:

$$\Delta_m = \max\left|\Delta_{\gamma^2}\right|, \quad \Delta_q = \Big\{\sum_\gamma \Delta^2_{\gamma^2}\Big\}^{1/2}, \text{ with } \Delta_{\gamma^2} \equiv \frac{\partial \ln v^2}{\partial \ln \gamma^2}, \tag{21}$$

where $\gamma = m_0, m_{12}, A_t, B_0, \mu_0$ for the constrained "non-linear" MSSM. In the following we evaluate Δ_m, Δ_q at the one-loop level in our model. Using eqs.(12) that give $m^2 = m^2(\gamma,\beta)$ and $\lambda = \lambda(\gamma,\beta)$ one has a general result for Δ_{γ^2} which takes into account that $\tan\beta$ depends on γ via the second min condition in eq.(12). The result is [20]

$$\Delta_{\gamma^2} = -\frac{\gamma}{2\,z}\left[\left(2\frac{\partial^2 m^2}{\partial\beta^2} + v^2\frac{\partial^2\lambda}{\partial\beta^2}\right)\left(\frac{\partial\lambda}{\partial\gamma} + \frac{1}{v^2}\frac{\partial m^2}{\partial\gamma}\right) + \frac{\partial m^2}{\partial\beta}\frac{\partial^2\lambda}{\partial\beta\partial\gamma} - \frac{\partial\lambda}{\partial\beta}\frac{\partial^2 m^2}{\partial\beta\partial\gamma}\right]. \tag{22}$$

where

$$z \equiv \lambda\left(2\frac{\partial^2 m^2}{\partial\beta^2} + v^2\frac{\partial^2\lambda}{\partial\beta^2}\right) - \frac{v^2}{2}\left(\frac{\partial\lambda}{\partial\beta}\right)^2. \tag{23}$$

Using these expressions, one obtains Δ_m and Δ_q.

Let us first consider the limit of large $\tan\beta$, so the first relation in eq.(12) becomes

$$v^2 = -\frac{2\,(m_2^2+\mu^2)}{(1+\delta)\,(g_1^2+g_2^2)/4 + 2\,m_2^4/f^2} + \mathcal{O}(\cot\beta) \tag{24}$$

which gives

$$\Delta_{\gamma^2} = -\frac{\partial(m_2^2+\mu^2)}{\partial\ln\gamma}\,\frac{(1+2\,v^2\,m_2^2/f^2)^s}{(1+\delta)\,m_Z^2 + 2\,v^2\,m_2^4/f^2} + \mathcal{O}(\cot\beta), \tag{25}$$

where $s = 1$ if $\gamma \neq \mu_0$; $s = 0$ if $\gamma = \mu_0$, and μ, m_2 are functions of the scale[7]. If also f is large, one recovers the MSSM corresponding expression (ignoring a $\tan\beta$ dependence of δ):

$$\Delta^0_{\gamma^2} = -\frac{\partial(m_2^2+\mu^2)}{\partial\ln\gamma}\,\frac{1}{(1+\delta)\,m_Z^2} + \mathcal{O}(\cot\beta). \tag{26}$$

which is interesting on its own. For the EW symmetry breaking to exist one must have $m_2^2 + \mu^2 < 0$ and therefore Δ_{γ^2} of the "nonlinear MSSM" is smaller than in the MSSM with similar UV boundary conditions for parameters γ. Indeed, in this case the ratio r of Δ_{γ^2} to that in a MSSM-like model denoted $\Delta^0_{\gamma^2}$:

[7] as we shall detail shortly for the case of the constrained MSSM.

$$r = \frac{\Delta_{\gamma^2}}{\Delta^0_{\gamma^2}} = \frac{(1+2\,v^2\,m_2^2/f^2)^s\,(1+\delta)\,m_Z^2}{(1+\delta)\,m_Z^2+2\,v^2\,m_2^4/f^2} + \mathcal{O}(\cot\beta), \tag{27}$$

is smaller than unity: $r \approx 1/2$ if $\delta \approx 0.8$, $|m_2^2|/f \approx 0.35$ and $r \approx 1/3$ if $\delta \approx 0.8$, $|m_2^2|/f \approx 0.5$ with $\sqrt{f}$ above the TeV scale (recall $|m_2^2|/f < 1$ for convergence and $\delta \sim 0.5-1$). So for a large $\tan\beta$ the EW fine tuning associated to each UV parameter is smaller relative to the MSSM and the same can then be said about overall Δ_m and Δ_q. This reduction is actually more significant, since for the same point in the parameter space the higgs mass is larger in the "nonlinear" MSSM than in the MSSM alone, already at the tree level. Indeed, we saw in eq.(20) that even in the absence of loop corrections one can easily achieve $m_h \approx 120$ GeV, without the additional, significant fine-tuning "cost", present for $m_h > 115$ GeV in the MSSM. This "cost" is $\Delta \sim \exp(\delta m_h/\text{GeV})$ due to loop corrections needed to increase m_h by δm_g in MSSM models[8]; for the same m_h the reduction is then expected to be by a factor $\Delta \sim \exp(120-115) \sim 150$ relative to the constrained MSSM case. Then our $\Delta_{m,q}$ can be smaller by this factor and r is also much smaller than unity when evaluated for the same m_h. Finally, fixing m_h to its measured value is a very strong constraint on the parameter space, which once satisfied, allows other EW constraints to be automatically respected [13], so this conclusion is unlikely to be affected by them.

Let us mention that in MSSM-like models the EW fine-tuning Δ is usually reduced as one increases $\tan\beta$ for a fixed m_h (all the other parameters allowed to vary) [17]. This is because at large $\tan\beta$ additional Yukawa couplings effects (down sector) are enhanced and help the radiative EW symmetry breaking (thus reducing Δ), while at small $\tan\beta$ this effect is suppressed [13]. The situation is similar in the above "nonlinear" MSSM model[9].

4.2 The constrained "non-linear" MSSM

The reduction of the EW fine tuning in our model can be illustrated further by comparing it with that in the constrained MSSM (CMSSM) with universal UV scalar mass m_0 and gaugino mass m_{12} and including only the top/stop Yukawa coupling correction. In that case one has

$$\begin{aligned}
m_1^2(t) &= m_0^2 + m_{12}^2\,\sigma_1(t), \qquad \mu^2(t) = \mu_0^2\,\sigma_8^2(t) \\
m_2^2(t) &= m_{12}^2\,\sigma_4(t) + A_t\,m_0\,m_{12}\,\sigma_5(t) + m_0^2\,\sigma_7(t) - m_0^2\,A_t^2\,\sigma_6(t) \\
m_3^2(t) &= \mu_0\,m_{12}\,\sigma_2(t) + B_0\,m_0\,\mu_0\,\sigma_8(t) + \mu_0\,m_0\,A_t\,\sigma_3(t)
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where we made explicit the dependence of soft masses $m_{1,2,3}$ and μ and of the coefficients σ_i on the momentum scale $t = \ln\Lambda_{UV}^2/q^2$ induced by radiative corrections; σ_i also depend on $\tan\beta$ and so do the soft masses. The high scale boundary conditions are chosen such as $\sigma_{1,2,3,4,5,6}(0)=0$, $\sigma_{7,8}(0)=1$ when quantum corrections are turned off. For $q^2=m_Z^2$ the values of σ_i are given in the Appendix. These expressions are used in our numerical analysis below.

[8] For this exponential dependence on m_h see figures 1 and 6 in the first reference in [17].

[9] As we show shortly for the conservative case of the constrained "non-linear" MSSM, at small $\tan\beta$, fine tuning is already acceptable, thus at larger $\tan\beta$ Δ is expected to be similar or further reduced.

4.2.1 The large $\tan\beta$ case

This regime was already discussed in the general case in Section 4.1. A numerical analysis of this case involves additional Yukawa couplings of the "down" sector not included in our V and is beyond the goal of this paper. However, we can still provide further insight for the constrained "nonlinear MSSM". From eq.(25), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{\mu_0^2} &= -\frac{2\mu_0^2\,\sigma_8^2}{(1+\delta)\,m_Z^2+2\,v^2 m_2^4/f^2}+\mathcal{O}(\cot^2\beta)\\
\Delta_{m_0^2} &= -\frac{m_0\,(1+2v^2m_2^2/f^2)}{(1+\delta)\,m_Z^2+2\,v^2\,m_2^4/f^2}(A_t\sigma_5-2A_t^2\,m_0\sigma_6+2m_0\sigma_7)+\mathcal{O}(\cot\beta)\\
\Delta_{m_{12}^2} &= -\frac{m_{12}\,(1+2v^2m_2^2/f^2)}{(1+\delta)\,m_Z^2+2\,v^2\,m_2^4/f^2}(2m_{12}\sigma_4+A_t\,m_0\sigma_5)+\mathcal{O}(\cot\beta)\\
\Delta_{A_t^2} &= -\frac{A_t\,(1+2v^2m_2^2/f^2)}{(1+\delta)\,m_Z^2+2\,v^2\,m_2^4/f^2}(m_{12}\sigma_5-2m_0\,A_t\sigma_6)\,m_0+\mathcal{O}(\cot\beta),\\
\Delta_{B_0^2} &= \mathcal{O}(\cot\beta)
\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

m_2^2 is given in eqs.(28) and with $m_2^2<0$, the absolute values of above Δ's and then of $\Delta_{m,q}$ are smaller than those in the limit $f\to\infty$ when one recovers the constrained MSSM model (at large $\tan\beta$). So fine tuning is reduced as already argued in the general discussion.

Turning off the quantum corrections to soft masses and μ ($\sigma_{1,2,..,6}=0$, $\sigma_{7,8}=1$) and quartic coupling ($\delta=0$), for large f, the above relations simplify to give for constrained MSSM

$$|\Delta_{\gamma^2}|=\frac{2\gamma^2}{m_Z^2}+\mathcal{O}(\cot\beta),\qquad \gamma=m_0,\mu_0\tag{30}$$

with remaining expressions being $\mathcal{O}(\cot\beta)$. This also shows that in the constrained MSSM, the dominant contributions to fine tuning (at classical level) are due to m_0 and μ_0. In general $\Delta_{m_0^2}$ is related to QCD effects that increase fine tuning and dominates for $m_h>115$ GeV (fig.2 in first reference in [17]). For TeV-valued $m_0=\mu_0=2$ TeV ($\delta=0$) one then has $\Delta_q=683$ which gives a good estimate of the value of fine tuning in constrained MSSM[10]. Eq.(30) has close similarities to other fine-tuning measures defined in the literature such as Δ_{EW} of [37].

4.2.2 The small $\tan\beta$ case

From eqs.(21), (22), (23) we find the following analytical results for Δ_{γ^2} at one loop level:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{\mu_0^2} &= -\frac{4}{D\,v^2}\Big\{-2f^2y_1\sin2\beta\Big[(4+\delta)f^2m_Z^2+2v^2(y_1^2+y_2^2)-2(\delta f^2m_Z^2+v^2\,y_2\,y_3)\cos2\beta\\
&+\big[(4+\delta)f^2m_Z^2+2v^2y_1^2\big]\cos4\beta-2v^2y_1y_2\sin4\beta\Big]+\Big[\big[f^2(m_Z^2\delta+4y_2)+2v^2y_2y_3\big]\cos2\beta\\
&-\big[(4+\delta)f^2m_Z^2+2v^2(-y_1^2+y_2^2)\big]\cos4\beta+2y_1(4f^2+v^2y_3-4v^2y_2\cos2\beta)\sin2\beta\Big]\\
&\times\Big[8f^2\mu_0^2\sigma_8^2+v^2y_1^2+y_1\big[-4f^2\sin2\beta+v^2(-y_1\cos4\beta-2y_3\sin2\beta+y_2\sin4\beta)\big]\Big]\Big\}
\end{aligned}\tag{31}$$

[10]For $m_h\approx126$ GeV, in constrained MSSM $\Delta_{m,q}\sim800-1000$ [13].

$$\Delta_{m_0^2} = -\frac{4f^2 m_0}{D}\Big\{4\Big[\big[f^2(m_Z^2\delta+4y_2)+2v^2y_2y_3\big]\cos 2\beta-\big[(4+\delta)f^2m_Z^2+2v^2(y_2^2-y_1^2)\big]\cos 4\beta$$
$$+2y_1\big[4f^2+v^2(y_3-4y_2\cos 2\beta)\big]\sin 2\beta\Big]\Big[v^{-2}\big[2m_0\cos^2\beta+y_4\sin^2\beta-\mu_0(A_t\sigma_3+B_0\sigma_8)\sin 2\beta\big]$$
$$+(1/f^2)\big[2m_0\cos^2\beta-\mu_0(A_t\sigma_3+B_0\sigma_8)\cos\beta\sin\beta+y_4\sin^2\beta\big](y_3-y_2\cos 2\beta-y_1\sin 2\beta)\Big]$$
$$+\ \ 8\,(-2y_1\cos 2\beta+y_2\sin 2\beta)\Big[(1/2)\big[\mu_0(A_t\sigma_3+B_0\sigma_8)\cos 2\beta+(2m_0-y_4)\sin 2\beta\big]$$
$$\times\ \ (y_2\cos 2\beta-y_3+y_1\sin 2\beta)-\big[2m_0\cos^2\beta-\mu_0(A_t\sigma_3+B_0\sigma_8)(1/2)\sin 2\beta+y_4\sin^2\beta\big]$$
$$\times\ \ (y_1\cos 2\beta-y_2\sin 2\beta)\Big]+(1/v^2)\big[2\mu_0(A_t\sigma_3+B_0\sigma_8)\cos 2\beta+(2m_0-y_4)\sin 2\beta\big]$$
$$\times\ \ \big[-2f^2m_Z^2(-\delta+(4+\delta)\cos 2\beta)\sin 2\beta+4v^2(-y_3+y_2cos2\beta+y_1\sin 2\beta)(y_1\cos 2\beta$$
$$-\ \ y_2\sin 2\beta)\big]\Big\} \tag{32}$$

and

$$\Delta_{m_{12}^2} = \frac{-4f^2m_{12}}{D}\Big\{4\Big[\big[f^2(m_Z^2\delta+4y_2)+2v^2y_2y_3\big]\cos 2\beta-\big[(4+\delta)f^2m_Z^2+2v^2(y_2^2-y_1^2)\big]$$
$$\times\ \ \cos 4\beta+2y_1(4f^2+v^2y_3-4v^2y_2\cos 2\beta)\sin 2\beta\Big]\Big[\frac{1}{v^2}\big[2m_{12}\sigma_1\cos^2\beta-\mu_0\sigma_2\sin 2\beta$$
$$+\ \ (2m_{12}\sigma_4+A_tm_0\sigma_5)\sin^2\beta\big]+(1/f^2)\big[2m_{12}\sigma_1\cos^2\beta-(1/2)\,\mu_0\sigma_2\sin 2\beta$$
$$+\ \ (2m_{12}\sigma_4+A_tm_0\sigma_5)\sin^2\beta\big](y_3-y_2\cos 2\beta-y_1\sin 2\beta)\Big]+8\,(y_2\sin 2\beta-2y_1\cos 2\beta)$$
$$\times\ \Big[(1/2)\big[\mu_0\sigma_2\cos 2\beta+\big(2m_{12}(\sigma_1-\sigma_4)-A_tm_0\sigma_5\big)\sin 2\beta\big](-y_3+y_2\cos 2\beta+y_1\sin 2\beta)$$
$$-\ \big[2m_{12}\sigma_1\cos^2\beta-\frac{1}{2}\mu_0\sigma_2\sin 2\beta+(2m_{12}\sigma_4+A_tm_0\sigma_5)\sin^2\beta\big](y_1\cos 2\beta-y_2\sin 2\beta)\Big]$$
$$+\ \ (1/v^2)\Big[2\mu_0\sigma_2\cos 2\beta+\big[2m_{12}(\sigma_1-\sigma_4)-A_tm_0\sigma_5\big]\sin 2\beta\Big]\Big[-2f^2m_Z^2(-\delta$$
$$+\ \ (4+\delta)\cos 2\beta)\sin 2\beta+4v^2(-y_3+y_2\cos 2\beta+y_1\sin 2\beta)(y_1\cos 2\beta-y_2\sin 2\beta)\Big]\Big\} \tag{33}$$

and

$$\Delta_{A_t^2} = \frac{-4A_t}{D}\Big\{8f^2(y_2\sin 2\beta-2y_1\cos 2\beta)\Big[(m_0/2)\big(\mu_0\sigma_3\cos 2\beta+(2A_tm_0\sigma_6-m_{12}\sigma_5)\sin 2\beta\big)$$
$$\times(-y_3+y_2\cos 2\beta+y_1\sin 2\beta)+m_0\sin\beta\big[\mu_0\sigma_3\cos\beta+(-m_{12}\sigma_5+2A_tm_0\sigma_6)\sin\beta\big]$$
$$\times(y_1\cos 2\beta-y_2\sin 2\beta)\Big]+(f^2/v^2)m_0\big[2\mu_0\sigma_3\cos 2\beta+(-m_{12}\sigma_5+2A_tm_0\sigma_6)\sin 2\beta\big]$$
$$\times\Big[-2f^2m_Z^2\big[-\delta+(4+\delta)\cos 2\beta\big]\sin 2\beta+4v^2(-y_3+y_2\cos 2\beta+y_1\sin 2\beta)$$
$$\times(y_1\cos 2\beta-y_2\sin 2\beta)\Big]-(4/v^2)m_0\sin\beta\Big[\big(f^2(\delta m_Z^2+4y_2)+2v^2y_2y_3\big)\cos 2\beta$$
$$-\ \big[f^2m_Z^2(4+\delta)+2v^2(-y_1^2+y_2^2)\big]\cos 4\beta+2y_1(4f^2+v^2y_3-4v^2y_2\cos 2\beta)\sin 2\beta\Big]$$
$$\times\Big[\mu_0\sigma_3\cos\beta\left[2f^2+v^2y_3-v^2\left(y_2\cos 2\beta+y_1\sin 2\beta\right)\right]+(m_{12}\sigma_5-2A_tm_0\sigma_6)\sin\beta$$
$$\times\ \big[-f^2-v^2y_3+v^2(y_2\cos 2\beta+y_1\sin 2\beta)\big]\Big]\Big\}. \tag{34}$$

Finally



Figure 2: The EW fine tuning Δ_m (left) and Δ_q (right) as functions of the SM-like Higgs mass m_h (in GeV), all evaluated at one-loop, for $\tan\beta \leq 10$. These plots have a fixed value $\sqrt{f} = 2.8$ TeV of the SUSY breaking scale and $\tan\beta$ increases from left ($\tan\beta \leq 2.5$) to right ($\tan\beta = 10$) as shown by different colours: black/leftmost region: $\tan\beta \leq 2.5$; purple: $2.5 \leq \tan\beta \leq 4$; blue: $4 \leq \tan\beta \leq 4.5$; cyan: $4.5 \leq \tan\beta \leq 5.5$; yellow: $5.5 \leq \tan\beta \leq 9.5$; red/rightmost region: $\tan\beta = 10$ (a larger $\tan\beta$ region is on top of that of smaller $\tan\beta$). For $m_h = 126$ GeV, minimal $\Delta_m \approx 80$ and $\Delta_q \approx 120$ while in the corresponding constrained MSSM minimal values (for $\tan\beta < 55$), $\Delta_m \sim \Delta_q \approx 800 - 1000$, too large to be shown here; for details see figures 1-8 in [13]. The wide range of values for m_h was chosen only to display the $\tan\beta$ dependence and to allow for the 2-3 GeV theoretical error of m_h [16].

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{B_0^2} &= -\frac{8B_0 m_0 \mu_0 \sigma_8}{D}\Big\{\frac{\sin 2\beta}{v^2}\Big[\big(f^2(\delta\, m_Z^2 + 4y_2) + 2v^2 y_2 y_3\big)\cos 2\beta - \big[(4+\delta)f^2 m_Z^2 \\
&+ 2v^2(-y_1^2 + y_2^2)\big]\cos 4\beta + 2y_1(4f^2 + v^2 y_3 - 4v^2 y_2 \cos 2\beta)\sin 2\beta\Big]\big[-2f^2 - v^2 y_3 \\
&+ v^2(y_2 \cos 2\beta + y_1 \sin 2\beta)\big] + \frac{f^2}{v^2}\cos 2\beta\Big[-2f^2 m_Z^2\big[-\delta + (4+\delta)\cos 2\beta\big]\sin 2\beta \\
&+ 4v^2(-y_3 + y_2 \cos 2\beta + y_1 \sin 2\beta)(y_1 \cos 2\beta - y_2 \sin 2\beta)\Big] \\
&- 2f^2(2y_1 \cos 2\beta - y_2 \sin 2\beta)(-y_3 \cos 2\beta + y_2 \cos 4\beta + y_1 \sin 4\beta)\Big\} \qquad (35)
\end{aligned}$$

The denominator D used in the above formulae is

$$\begin{aligned}
D &\equiv 2f^2\Big[\big[f^2(m_Z^2\delta + 4y_2) + 2v^2 y_2 y_3\big]\cos 2\beta - \big[(4+\delta)f^2 m_Z^2 + 2v^2(y_2^2 - y_1^2)\big]\cos 4\beta \\
&+ 2y_1(4f^2 + v^2 y_3 - 4v^2 y_2 \cos 2\beta)\sin 2\beta\Big]\Big[8(m_Z^2/v^2)\big(\cos^2 2\beta + \delta \sin^4\beta\big) + (4/f^2)\,(-y_3 \\
&+ y_2 \cos 2\beta + y_1 \sin 2\beta\,)^2\Big] - (1/v^2)\Big[-4v^2(-y_3 + y_2 \cos 2\beta + y_1 \sin 2\beta)(y_1 \cos 2\beta \\
&- y_2 \sin 2\beta) + f^2 m_Z^2\big(-2\delta \sin 2\beta + (4+\delta)\sin 4\beta\big)\Big]^2 \qquad (36)
\end{aligned}$$

In the above expressions we introduced the notations:



Figure 3: Δ_m (left) and Δ_q (right), with similar considerations as for Figure 2 but with $\sqrt{f} = 3.2$ TeV. In this case, minimal $\Delta_m = 105$ and $\Delta_q = 145$ for $m_h = 126$ GeV.

$$\begin{aligned} y_1 &\equiv \mu_0(m_{12}\sigma_2 + A_t\, m_0\, \sigma_3 + B_0 m_0 \sigma_8) \\ y_2 &\equiv -m_{12}^2(\sigma_1 - \sigma_4) - m_0(m_0 - A_t m_{12}\sigma_5 + A_t^2 m_0\sigma_6 - m_0\sigma_7) \\ y_3 &\equiv y_2 + 2\sigma_1 m_{12}^2 + 2m_0^2,\;\; y_4 \equiv A_t m_{12}\sigma_5 - 2A_t^2 m_0\sigma_6 + 2m_0\sigma_7 \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

The expressions for Δ_{γ^2} simplify considerably if one turns off the quantum corrections to the soft terms ($\sigma_{1,2,..6} = 0$, $\sigma_{7,8} = 1$). We checked that in the limit of large f, Δ_{γ^2} recover the analytical results for fine tuning at one-loop found in [31] for the constrained MSSM (plus corrections $\mathcal{O}(1/f^2)$). One also recovers from the above expressions for Δ_{γ^2} the results in eqs.(29).

4.3 Numerical results

Using the results in eqs.(31) to (37) we evaluated Δ_m and Δ_q for fixed values of the SUSY breaking scale in the hidden sector $\sqrt{f}$ for $\tan\beta \leq 10$, subject to the EW constraints (for a discussion of these, see [13]). Note that imposing the higgs mass range of $126 \pm (2\,\text{to}\,3)$ GeV (to allow for the theoretical error [16]) automatically respects these constraints [13]. For a rapid convergence of the perturbative expansion in $1/f$ of the Lagrangian we demanded that $m_{soft}^2/f < 1/4$. The results are shown in Figures 2, 3, 4.

For $m_h = 126$ GeV we find *minimal* values of $\Delta_m \approx 80$ and $\Delta_q \approx 120$ for $\sqrt{f} = 2.8$ TeV (Figure 2) and $\Delta_m \approx 105$ and $\Delta_q \approx 145$ for $\sqrt{f} = 3.2$ TeV (Figure 3). These values of $\sqrt{f}$ are well above the current lower bound of ≈ 700 GeV [2, 21, 33, 34]. As one increases $\tan\beta$ for a given m_h, Δ_m or Δ_q decreases, as shown by the colour encoding corresponding to fixed $\tan\beta$ in Figures 2, 3; this is also valid in the MSSM as seen in Figures 3, 4, 5 in the first reference in [17]. These values for fine tuning are already "acceptable" and significantly below the *minimal* values in the constrained MSSM where for $m_h \approx 126$ GeV, $\Delta_{m,q} \approx 800 - 1000$, see Figures 1-8 in [13], obtained after scanning over all $2 \leq \tan\beta \leq 55$.

The reduced values of Δ_m and Δ_q are due to the fact that m_h is significantly above that of the constrained MSSM already at the classical level, see eqs.(17) to (20) for $\delta = 0$, where values of $120 - 126$ GeV are easily achieved, so only very small quantum corrections are



Figure 4: The dependence of *minimal* Δ_m (left) and Δ_q (right) on m_h (GeV) for different $\sqrt{f}$, for fixed $\tan\beta = 10$ with the other parameters allowed to vary. We allowed a ± 2 GeV (theoretical) error for m_h [16] about the central value of 126 GeV. For a fixed m_h the minimal values of Δ_m, Δ_q increase as we increase $\sqrt{f}$ from the lowest to the top curve, in this order: 2.8 TeV (the lower/red curve), 3.2 TeV (orange), 3.9 TeV (brown), 5 TeV (green), 5.5 TeV (dark green), 6.3 TeV (cyan), 7.4 TeV (blue), 8 TeV (dark blue), 8.7 TeV (black/top curve). The lowest two curves (red, orange) correspond to the minimal values of Δ_m and Δ_q in Figures 2, 3. For large enough $\sqrt{f} \geq 10$ TeV, one recovers the MSSM-like values of Δ_m, Δ_q for a similar m_h.

actually needed (unlike in the MSSM). This is a consequence of the (classically) increased effective quartic higgs coupling. Also notice that minimal values of Δ_m and Δ_q have a similar dependence on m_h and are only mildly different in size, as also noticed for the MSSM [13].

In Figure 4 we presented the minimal values of Δ_m and Δ_q as functions of m_h for fixed $\tan\beta = 10$ for different values of the SUSY breaking scale from $\sqrt{f} = 2.8$ TeV to 8.7 TeV. When increasing $\sqrt{f}$ to larger values, in the region above 10 TeV, the effects of the additional quartic terms in the scalar higgs potential are rapidly suppressed and one recovers the usual constrained MSSM-like scenario with similar UV boundary conditions, with larger fine tuning for the same m_h and with minimal $\Delta_{q,m} \sim \exp(m_h/\text{GeV})$ (see the top curves in Figure 4). This exponential behaviour is characteristic to MSSM-like models due to (large) quantum corrections to the Higgs mass [17]. Relaxing the UV universality boundary condition for the gaugino masses reduces $\Delta_{m,q}$ further, similar to the MSSM [13, 35, 36], by a factor of ≈ 2 from the values given by the curves in Figure 4. Thus, values of $\sqrt{f}$ of up to 5-6 TeV can still give an EW fine tuning of about ~ 100, for the low $\tan\beta$ regime considered here.

The case of constrained "non-linear" MSSM at small $\tan\beta \leq 10$, for which we found "acceptable" values for $\Delta_{m,q}$, is the most conservative scenario. We saw in Figures 2,3 that for the same m_h a larger $\tan\beta$ reduces fine tuning and this behaviour continues to $\tan\beta \sim 40-50$. Then additional Yukawa couplings also play a significant role at larger $\tan\beta$ and reduce fine-tuning further by improving the radiative EW symmetry breaking for the same m_h (this is because radiative EW symmetry breaking effects are enhanced relative to opposite, QCD ones that increase fine-tuning [17]). We thus expect that for the case of large $\tan\beta$ with additional Yukawa couplings included the values quoted here for Δ_m, Δ_q be maintained or reduced further.

5 Conclusions

The significant amount of EW fine tuning Δ present in the MSSM-like models for $m_h \approx 126$ GeV has prompted an increased interest in finding ways to reduce its value. This is motivated by the fact that Δ is usually regarded as a measure of the success of SUSY in solving the hierarchy problem. Additional reasons to seek a low Δ exist, from the relation of the EW fine tuning to the variation $\delta\chi^2$ about the minimal chi-square χ^2_{min} and the s-standard deviation upper bound on $\delta\chi^2$ usually sought in the data fits. Reducing Δ can indeed be achieved, but it usually requires the introduction of additional fields in the visible sector, beyond those of the original model. For example one can consider MSSM-like models with additional, massive gauge singlets present, extra gauge symmetries, etc.

Another view is that a large EW fine tuning may indicate a problem with our understanding of supersymmetry breaking. Motivated by this we considered the case of MSSM-like models with a low scale of supersymmetry breaking in the hidden sector, $\sqrt{f} \sim$ few TeV. As a result of this, sizeable quartic effective interactions are present in the Higgs potential, generated by the exchange of the auxiliary field of the goldstino superfield. Such couplings are proportional to the ratio of the soft breaking terms m_{soft} in the visible sector to the SUSY breaking scale $\sqrt{f}$ of the hidden sector. Thus, such couplings are significant in models with $\sqrt{f} \sim$ few TeV and are negligible when $\sqrt{f}$ is large, which is the usual MSSM scenario. These couplings have significant implications for the higgs mass and the EW fine-tuning. This behaviour is generic in low-scale SUSY models.

For the most conservative case of a constrained "non-linear" MSSM model and at low $\tan\beta$, we computed the level of EW scale fine tuning measured by two definitions for Δ (Δ_m, Δ_q). We examined $\Delta_{m,q}$ as a function of the SM-like higgs mass, in the one-loop approximation for these quantities. The results show that for $m_h \approx 126$ GeV, fine tuning is reduced from *minimal* values of $\approx 800 - 1000$ in the constrained MSSM to more acceptable values of $\sim 80 - 100$ in our model with $\sqrt{f} \sim 2.8 - 3.2$ TeV. These values for Δ are expected to be further reduced by considering non-universal gaugino masses. We argued that a similar reduction of Δ is expected at large $\tan\beta$ in our model. For larger $\sqrt{f}$, usually above 10 TeV, one recovers the case of MSSM-like models. Unlike other similar studies, this reduction was possible without additional fields in the visible sector and depends only on the ratio(s) m^2_{soft}/f; one may even consider increasing both m_{soft} and $\sqrt{f}$, while keeping their ratio fixed.

We assumed that in our case the sgoldstino was massive enough and integrated out, by using the superfield constraint that decouples it from the low energy. Corrections to our result can then arise from the scalar potential for the sgoldstino that depends on the structure of its Kahler potential (that gives mass to it) and superpotential in the hidden sector. Another correction can arise from future experimental constraints that may increase the lower bounds on the value of $\sqrt{f}$, currently near ≈ 700 GeV, if no supersymmetry or other new physics signal is found.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported in part by the European Commission under the ERC Advanced Grant 226371. The work of D. M. Ghilencea was supported by a grant of the Romanian Research Council project number PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0607 and in part by National Programme 'Nucleu' PN 09 37 01 02.

Appendix

The coefficients σ_i at the EW scale, used in the text, eq.(28) have the expressions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_1(t_z) &= 0.532, & \sigma_2(t_z) &= 0.282\,(4.127\,h_t^2 - 2.783)(1.310 - h_t^2)^{1/4} \\
\sigma_3(t_z) &= -0.501\,h_t^2\,(1.310 - h_t^2)^{1/4}, & \sigma_4(t_z) &= 0.532 - 5.233\,h_t^2 + 1.569\,h_t^4 \\
\sigma_5(t_z) &= 0.125\,h_t^2\,(10.852\,h_t^2 - 14.221), & \sigma_6(t_z) &= -0.027\,h_t^2\,(10.852\,h_t^2 - 14.221) \\
\sigma_7(t_z) &= 1 - 1.145\,h_t^2, & \sigma_8(t_z) &= 1.314\,(1.310 - h_t^2)^{1/4}
\end{aligned} \qquad \text{(A-1)}$$

where h_t is evaluated at m_Z and $m_t = h_t(t_{m_t})\,(v/\sqrt{2})\sin\beta$, ($v = 246$ GeV), $t = \ln\Lambda^2/q^2$, $t_z = \ln\Lambda_{UV}^2/m_Z^2$.

References

[1] P. Fayet, "Mixing Between Gravitational And Weak Interactions Through The Massive Gravitino," Phys. Lett. B **70** (1977) 461. "Weak Interactions Of A Light Gravitino: A Lower Limit On The Gravitino Mass From The Decay Psi → Gravitino Anti-Photino," Phys. Lett. B **84** (1979) 421. "Scattering Cross-Sections Of The Photino And The Goldstino (Gravitino) On Matter," Phys. Lett. B **86** (1979) 272. R. Casalbuoni, S. De Curtis, D. Dominici, F. Feruglio and R. Gatto, "A Gravitino - Goldstino High-Energy Equivalence Theorem," Phys. Lett. B **215** (1988) 313 "High-Energy Equivalence Theorem In Spontaneously Broken Supergravity," Phys. Rev. D **39** (1989) 2281.

[2] I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas, D. M. Ghilencea and P. Tziveloglou, "Non-linear MSSM," Nucl. Phys. B **841** (2010) 157 [arXiv:1006.1662 [hep-ph]].

[3] C. Petersson and A. Romagnoni, "The MSSM Higgs Sector with a Dynamical Goldstino Supermultiplet," JHEP **1202** (2012) 142 [arXiv:1111.3368 [hep-ph]].

[4] Z. Komargodski and N. Seiberg, "From Linear SUSY to Constrained Superfields," JHEP **0909** (2009) 066 [arXiv:0907.2441 [hep-th]]. R. Casalbuoni, S. De Curtis, D. Dominici, F. Feruglio and R. Gatto, "Nonlinear realization of supersymmetry algebra from supersymmetric constraint" Phys. Lett. B **220** (1989) 569.

[5] M. Rocek, "Linearizing The Volkov-Akulov Model," Phys. Rev. Lett. **41** (1978) 451.

[6] U. Lindstrom, M. Rocek, "Constrained Local Superfields," Phys. Rev. D **19** (1979) 2300.

[7] E. Dudas, G. von Gersdorff, D. M. Ghilencea, S. Lavignac and J. Parmentier, "On non-universal Goldstino couplings to matter," Nucl. Phys. B **855** (2012) 570 [arXiv:1106.5792 [hep-th]]. I. Antoniadis and D. M. Ghilencea, "Low-scale SUSY breaking and the (s)goldstino physics," Nucl. Phys. B **870** (2013) 278 [arXiv:1210.8336 [hep-th]]. I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas and D. M. Ghilencea, "Goldstino and sgoldstino in microscopic models and the constrained superfields formalism," Nucl. Phys. B **857** (2012) 65 [arXiv:1110.5939 [hep-th]].

[8] S. Demidov and K. Astapov, "Implications of sgoldstino-Higgs mixing," PoS QFTHEP **2013** (2014) 090. D. S. Gorbunov and V. A. Rubakov, "On sgoldstino interpretation of HyperCP events," Phys. Rev. D **73** (2006) 035002 [hep-ph/0509147].

[9] J. R. Ellis, K. Enqvist, D. V. Nanopoulos and F. Zwirner, "Observables In Low-Energy Superstring Models," Mod. Phys. Lett. A 1 (1986) 57. R. Barbieri and G. F. Giudice, "Upper Bounds On Supersymmetric Particle Masses," Nucl. Phys. B 306 (1988) 63;

[10] G. W. Anderson and D. J. Castano, "Measures of fine tuning," Phys. Lett. B **347** (1995) 300 [hep-ph/9409419]. G. W. Anderson and D. J. Castano, "Naturalness and superpartner masses or when to give up on weak scale supersymmetry," Phys. Rev. D **52** (1995) 1693 [hep-ph/9412322].

[11] R. Barbieri and A. Strumia, "About the fine tuning price of LEP," Phys. Lett. B **433** (1998) 63 [hep-ph/9801353]. P. H. Chankowski, J. R. Ellis, M. Olechowski and S. Pokorski, "Haggling over the fine tuning price of LEP," Nucl. Phys. B **544** (1999) 39 [hep-ph/9808275]. G. L. Kane and S. F. King, "Naturalness implications of LEP results," Phys. Lett. B **451** (1999) 113 [hep-ph/9810374]. P. H. Chankowski, J. R. Ellis and S. Pokorski, "The Fine tuning price of LEP," Phys. Lett. B **423** (1998) 327 [hep-ph/9712234]. G. F. Giudice and R. Rattazzi, "Living Dangerously with Low-Energy Supersymmetry," Nucl. Phys. B **757** (2006) 19 [hep-ph/0606105].

[12] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], "Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC," Phys. Lett. B **716** (2012) 1 [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]]. S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], "Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC," Phys. Lett. B **716** (2012) 30 [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]]. See also ATLAS-CONF-2012-162, "Updated ATLAS results on the signal strength of the Higgs-like boson for decays into WW and heavy fermion final states", Nov.2012. Report CMS-PAS-HIG-12-045, "Combination of standard model Higgs boson searches and measurements of the properties of the new boson with a mass near 125 GeV", 23 Nov 2012.

[13] D. M. Ghilencea, H. M. Lee, M. Park, "Tuning supersymmetric models at the LHC: A comparative analysis at 2-loop level," JHEP **1207** (2012) 046 [arXiv:1203.0569 [hep-ph]].

[14] D. M. Ghilencea and G. G. Ross, "The fine-tuning cost of the likelihood in SUSY models," Nucl. Phys. B **868** (2013) 65 [arXiv:1208.0837 [hep-ph]]. D. M. Ghilencea, "Fixing the EW scale in supersymmetric models after the Higgs discovery," Nucl. Phys. B **876** (2013) 16 [arXiv:1302.5262 [hep-ph]]. "A new approach to Naturalness in SUSY models," PoS Corfu **2012** (2013) 034 [arXiv:1304.1193 [hep-ph]].

[15] B. C. Allanach, K. Cranmer, C. G. Lester and A. M. Weber, "Natural priors, CMSSM fits and LHC weather forecasts", JHEP 0708 (2007) 023 [arXiv:0705.0487 [hep-ph]]. M. E. Cabrera, J. A. Casas and R. Ruiz de Austri, "Bayesian approach and Naturalness in MSSM analyses for the LHC", JHEP **0903** (2009) 075 [arXiv:0812.0536 [hep-ph]]. M. E. Cabrera, J. A. Casas and R. Ruiz d Austri, "MSSM Forecast for the LHC", JHEP **1005** (2010) 043 [arXiv:0911.4686 [hep-ph]]. S. S. AbdusSalam, B. C. Allanach,

F. Quevedo, F. Feroz and M. Hobson, "Fitting the Phenomenological MSSM", Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010) 095012 [arXiv:0904.2548 [hep-ph]].

[16] B. C. Allanach,"SOFTSUSY: a program for calculating supersymmetric spectra," Comput. Phys. Commun. 143 (2002) 305 [hep-ph/0104145]. G. Degrassi, S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, P. Slavich and G. Weiglein, "Towards high precision predictions for the MSSM Higgs sector", Eur. Phys. J. C 28 (2003) 133 [hep-ph/0212020]. S. Heinemeyer, "MSSM Higgs physics at higher orders", Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 21 (2006) 2659 [hep-ph/0407244].

[17] S. Cassel, D. M. Ghilencea and G. G. Ross, "Testing SUSY at the LHC: Electroweak and Dark matter fine tuning at two-loop order," arXiv:1001.3884 [hep-ph]; "Testing SUSY," arXiv:0911.1134 [hep-ph]. S. Cassel, D. M. Ghilencea, S. Kraml, A. Lessa and G. G. Ross, "Fine-tuning implications for complementary dark matter and LHC SUSY searches," JHEP **1105** (2011) 120 [arXiv:1101.4664 [hep-ph]]. S. Cassel and D. M. Ghilencea, "A Review of naturalness and dark matter prediction for the Higgs mass in MSSM and beyond," Mod. Phys. Lett. A **27** (2012) 1230003 [arXiv:1103.4793 [hep-ph]].

[18] P. Bechtle, T. Bringmann, K. Desch, H. Dreiner, M. Hamer, C. Hensel, M. Kramer and N. Nguyen *et al.*, "Constrained Supersymmetry after two years of LHC data: a global view with Fittino," JHEP **1206** (2012) 098 [arXiv:1204.4199 [hep-ph]].

[19] D. M. Ghilencea, "SUSY naturalness without prejudice," Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 095007 [arXiv:1311.6144 [hep-ph]].

[20] J. A. Casas, J. R. Espinosa and I. Hidalgo, "The MSSM fine tuning problem: A way out," JHEP **0401** (2004) 008 [arXiv:hep-ph/0310137]; "A relief to the supersymmetric fine tuning problem," arXiv:hep-ph/0402017.

[21] A. Brignole, J. A. Casas, J. R. Espinosa and I. Navarro, "Low-scale supersymmetry breaking: Effective description, electroweak breaking and phenomenology," Nucl. Phys. B **666** (2003) 105 [arXiv:hep-ph/0301121].

[22] G. G. Ross and K. Schmidt-Hoberg, "The Fine-Tuning of the Generalised NMSSM," Nucl. Phys. B **862** (2012) 710 [arXiv:1108.1284 [hep-ph]]. G. G. Ross, K. Schmidt-Hoberg and F. Staub, "The Generalised NMSSM at One Loop: Fine Tuning and Phenomenology," JHEP **1208** (2012) 074 [arXiv:1205.1509 [hep-ph]]. See also [31].

[23] M. T. Grisaru, M. Rocek and A. Karlhede, "The Superhiggs Effect in Superspace," Phys. Lett. B **120** (1983) 110. E. Cremmer, B. Julia, J. Scherk, P. van Nieuwenhuizen, S. Ferrara and L. Girardello, "SuperHiggs Effect in Supergravity with General Scalar Interactions," Phys. Lett. B **79** (1978) 231.

[24] D. V. Volkov and V. P. Akulov, "Is the Neutrino a Goldstone Particle?," Phys. Lett. B **46** (1973) 109.

[25] T. E. Clark and S. T. Love, "Goldstino couplings to matter," Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 5723 [arXiv:hep-ph/9608243].

[26] T. E. Clark, T. Lee, S. T. Love and G. Wu, "On the interactions of light gravitinos," Phys. Rev. D **57** (1998) 5912 [arXiv:hep-ph/9712353].

[27] A. Brignole, F. Feruglio and F. Zwirner, "On the effective interactions of a light gravitino with matter fermions," JHEP **9711** (1997) 001 [arXiv:hep-th/9709111];

[28] M. A. Luty and E. Ponton, "Effective Lagrangians and light gravitino phenomenology," Phys. Rev. D **57** (1998) 4167 hep-ph/9706268,v3 [revised version of Phys. Rev. D **57** (1998) 4167].

[29] E. A. Ivanov, A. A. Kapustnikov, "General relationship between linear and nonlinear realizations of supersymmetry," J.Phys. A **11** (1978) 2375. "The nonlinear realization structure of models with spontaneously broken supersymmetry," J.Phys. G **8** (1982) 167.

[30] S. Samuel and J. Wess, "A Superfield Formulation Of The Nonlinear Realization Of Supersymmetry And Its Coupling To Supergravity," Nucl. Phys. B **221** (1983) 153.

[31] S. Cassel, D. M. Ghilencea and G. G. Ross, "Fine tuning as an indication of physics beyond the MSSM," Nucl. Phys. B **825** (2010) 203 [arXiv:0903.1115 [hep-ph]].

[32] M. Carena, K. Kong, E. Ponton and J. Zurita, "Supersymmetric Higgs Bosons and Beyond," Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010) 015001 [arXiv:0909.5434]. M. Carena, E. Ponton and J. Zurita, "BMSSM Higgs Bosons at the Tevatron and the LHC," arXiv:1005.4887. I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas, D. M. Ghilencea, P. Tziveloglou, "MSSM Higgs with dimension-six operators," Nucl. Phys. B **831** (2010) 133 [arXiv:0910.1100 [hep-ph]]. "Beyond the MSSM Higgs with d=6 effective operators," Nucl. Phys. B **848** (2011) 1 [arXiv:1012.5310 [hep-ph]]. "MSSM with Dimension-five Operators ($MSSM_5$)," Nucl. Phys. B **808** (2009) 155 [arXiv:0806.3778 [hep-ph]]. I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas, D. M. Ghilencea, "Supersymmetric Models with Higher Dimensional Operators," JHEP **0803** (2008) 045 [arXiv:0708.0383 [hep-th]]. M. Dine, N. Seiberg and S. Thomas, "Higgs Physics as a Window Beyond the MSSM (BMSSM)," Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 095004 [arXiv:0707.0005 [hep-ph]]. s with d=6 effective operators," Nucl. Phys. B **848** (2011) 1 [arXiv:1012.5310 [hep-ph]]. "MSSM with Dimension-five Operators ($MSSM_5$)," Nucl. Phys. B **808** (2009) 155 [arXiv:0806.3778 [hep-ph]]. I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas, D. M. Ghilencea, "Supersymmetric Models with Higher Dimensional Operators," JHEP **0803** (2008) 045 [arXiv:0708.0383 [hep-th]]. M. Dine, N. Seiberg and S. Thomas, "Higgs Physics as a Window Beyond the MSSM (BMSSM)," Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 095004 [arXiv:0707.0005 [hep-ph]].

[33] M. A. Luty and E. Ponton, "Effective Lagrangians and light gravitino phenomenology", Phys. Rev. D 57 (1998) 4167 hep-ph/9706268,v3 [revised version of Phys. Rev. D 57 (1998) 4167].

[34] I. Antoniadis, M. Tuckmantel and F. Zwirner, "Phenomenology of a leptonic goldstino and invisible Higgs boson decays," Nucl. Phys. B **707** (2005) 215 [arXiv:hep-ph/0410165].

[35] G. L. Kane and S. F. King, "Naturalness implications of LEP results," Phys. Lett. B **451** (1999) 113 [hep-ph/9810374].

[36] D. Horton and G. G. Ross, "Naturalness and Focus Points with Non-Universal Gaugino Masses," Nucl. Phys. B **830** (2010) 221 [arXiv:0908.0857 [hep-ph]]. A. Kaminska, G. G. Ross and K. Schmidt-Hoberg, "Non-universal gaugino masses and fine tuning implications for SUSY searches in the MSSM and the GNMSSM," JHEP **1311** (2013) 209 [arXiv:1308.4168 [hep-ph]].

[37] H. Baer, "Radiative natural supersymmetry with mixed axion/higgsino cold dark matter," AIP Conf. Proc. **1534** (2012) 39 [arXiv:1210.7852 [hep-ph]]. H. Baer, V. Barger, P. Huang, A. Mustafayev and X. Tata, "Radiative natural SUSY with a 125 GeV Higgs boson," Phys. Rev. Lett. **109** (2012) 161802 [arXiv:1207.3343 [hep-ph]]. H. Baer, V. Barger, D. Mickelson and M. Padeffke-Kirkland, "SUSY models under siege: LHC constraints and electroweak fine-tuning," arXiv:1404.2277 [hep-ph].